

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/621,708	07/17/2003	Хиејил Qian	KMC / 304	1525	
26875 7	590 09/08/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP			YOON, TAE H		
2700 CAREW 441 VINE STR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CINCINNATI,	OH 45202		1714		
•			DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			V			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/621,708	QIAN, XUEJUN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tae H. Yoon	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet t	with the correspondence address	;			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become a	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this communi ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 A	August 2006.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	_ · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal ma	atters, prosecution as to the men	its is			
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 33-39 and 42-80 is/are pending in th	e application.		•			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>33-39 and 42-80</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		•			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•		` '			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-13)2.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	•			
 Certified copies of the priority document 	ts have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received in	Application No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		n received in this National Stag	е			
application from the International Burea	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies no	ot received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other: _					

Application/Control Number: 10/621,708

Art Unit: 1714

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 58-80 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-24, 26, 27, 29, 39-42, 52-56 and 60-68 of copending Application No. 10/440,804. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant composition would inherently yield bond strength of at least 3 MPa and the instant two pastes are obvious modification of the composition of said copending Application No. 10/440,804.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,708

Art Unit: 1714

Claims 33-39 and 42-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is New Matter rejection since the recited "at least one acidic compound comprising a homopolymer/copolymer of an α , β -unsaturated carboxylic acid containing---, wherein each of (a), (d), and (g) are in at least a substantially homogeneous phase." in claim 33 does not have support in the originally filed specification. Example 1 recites "homogeneous liquid mixture", but said mixture contains monomer(s), not said polymer.

Also, the recited homopolymer/copolymer only has support for the carboxylic acid containing monomers (see pages 11-12 of the specification).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 33-39 and 42-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 33 is indefinite absent a definition for "R". Also, claim 33 recites α , β -unsaturated carboxylic acid containing ---" and various acidic components. However, said (or recited) acidic components are not α , β -unsaturated carboxylic acid except the first moiety (-COOH). Thus, it is confusing with respect to the claimed acidic compound.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,708

Art Unit: 1714

111 2 4744

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Pat. 6,500,004 to Jensen et al teaches two-part dental composition containing bis glycerol dimethacrylate phosphate at col. 7, lines 32-45 and in example 1, but it teaches employing the same constituents of the resin sealing and filling in both parts. Thus, the instant invention utilizing different constituents of the resin in said two-part would not be obvious over said US Pat. 6,500,004.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H. Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,708 Page 5

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tae H Yoon //
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

THY/September 2, 2006